

## REMARKS

The following issues remain outstanding in the present application:

- claims 1-10, 18-21, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph;
- claims 1-4, 6-9, 18-21, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Bailey et al. in view of Slouka; and
- claims 5 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Bailey et al. in view of Slouka in further view of Hoffmeister et al.

### Preliminary Remarks/Interview Summary

Applicant's representative wishes to express his appreciation for the cordial reception during the in Office Interview conducted on July 20, 2009. The comments and suggestions for amending the claims to overcome the art of record was very helpful in preparing this amendment and Applicant's representative wishes to express his appreciation for the Examiner's assistance.

Specifically, during the interview, it was determined that regardless of which claim set was examined, the breadth of the claim language was problematic in view of the cited art. To remedy the perceived breadth of the claims, it was determined that the claims needed to be amended to recite more than just a dental bracket table, e.g., the claims should specifically recite that the dental bracket table includes dental tools, such as a drill, that are suspended over the patient by the table during surgery and powered by the components of the base unit. This would differentiate the table from the prior art trays of portable units that could be used to place an unpowered tool such as a mirror or scraper during a procedure.

To simplify entry of the amendments, Applicant's representative advised that all pending claims would be cancelled and a new claim set including the limitations discussed would be presented to expedite the prosecution of the application.